DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 325 CE 039 541

AUTHOR Ryan, M. Colleen; Friedman, Paul G.
TITLE Career Mentoring in a State Government Agency.
PUB DATE Nov 83
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Speech Communication Association Convention (Washington, DC, November 10-13, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Adults; *Career Development; Females; *Interprofessional Relationship; Males; *Mentors; Professional Development; Sex Differences; *State Government; *State Officials; *Supervisors; Supervisory Methods
IDENTIFIERS Kansas

ABSTRACT

Exchanges within the mentor-protege relationship, the effect of age and gender on that relationship, and the effect of that relationship on career progress and subsequent mentoring behavior are here studied for the first time in the context of a state government agency. Twenty-five males and 25 females were selected randomly from among 250 supervisors in the Kansas Department of Human Resources. Each completed the Career Influences Survey, an instrument created and assessed for internal reliability and construct validity especially for this study. Findings yielded a profile of mentoring behaviors received and provided by these supervisors, indicated a moderately significant relationship between the amount and kinds of mentoring received and provided, and revealed that men and women receive and provide similar amounts and kinds of mentoring (but that women provide more to other women than to men), that most supervisors report more primary (altruistic) reasons for mentoring than secondary (self-oriented) reasons, that supervisors' mentors were further from them in age than are their proteges and that the first mentor they encountered had the greatest influence on them. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248325

CAREER MENTORING

IN A STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCY

M. Colleen Ryan, Ph.D.
Counselor
Adult Life Resource Center
University of Kansas

Paul G. Friedman, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Communication Studies Department
University of Kansas

A paper submitted to the Commission on Research in Organizational Communication of the Speech Communication Association to consider for inclusion on the program of the 1983 convention in Washington, D.C.

CE039541

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M C Ryan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CAREER MENTORING IN A STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCY

ABSTRACT

Exchanges within the mentor-protege relationship, the effect of age and gender on that relationship, and the effect of that relationship on career progress and subsequent mentoring behavior are here studied for the first time in the context of a state government agency. Twenty-five males and 25 females were selected randomly from among 250 supervisors in the Kansas Department of Human Resources. Each completed the career Influencers Survey, an instrument created and assessed for internal reliability and construct validity especially for this study. Findings yielded a profile of mentoring behaviors received and provided by these supervisors, indicated a moderately significant relationship between the amount and kinds of mentoring received and provided, and revealed that men and women receive and provide similar amounts and kinds of mentoring (but that women provide more to other women than to men), that most supervisors report more primary (altruistic) reasons for mentoring than secondary (self-oriented) reasons, that supervisors' mentors were further from them in age than are their proteges and that the first mentor they encountered had the greatest influence on them.

Career Mentoring in a State Government Agency

Introduction

Work relationships have long been a concern of organizational communication researchers. Most investigations focus on factors in superior-subordinate and collegial relationships (as independent variables) and on employee productivity and satisfaction (as dependent variables). During the past two decades, however, increased attention has been given to a different kind of work relationship and outcome: the mentor-protege pair and career advancement. This study concerns the interaction within that dyad and its relationship to the protege's career success and subsequent mentoring behavior.

Some studies have described mentor-protege relationships in the private sector (Bray, 1974; Bass, 1976; Shapiro, et.al, 1978; Collin, 1979; Roche, 1979; Lynch, 1980; and Rawles, 1980). In the public sector, mentoring has been studied chiefly in educational settings (Erickson & Pitner, 1980; Moore & Salimbene, 1981; Cameron & Blackburn, 1981). Government organizations provide a distinct kind of work environment, one in which mentoring has yet to be studied. To begin filling that gap, we studied career mentoring among supervisors in the Kansas Department of Human Resources, a state government agency.

Gender has been a key variable in mentoring research, but findings vary. In interviews with 25 top-level women executives, Hennig and Jardim (1977) discovered that all reported the strong support of a male mentor. These mentors helped the women believe in their abilities,

acted as buffers against clients and other company members who felt threatened by these women proteges, and offered "protective custody." However, in her study of women managers at Indeco Corporation (1977), Kanter found that women tend to be excluded from networks in which "socialization" (a common function of mentoring) occurred. Laws (1975) also found that mentors were willing to sponsor and advise women, but not to include them in the "inner circle." Fitt and Newton (1981) found that a major risk for opposite sex mentor and protege pairs is the perception of others that their close association will evolve into sexual attachment. (This issue even reached the headlines recently in the case of William Agee and Mary Cunningham, formerly of the Bendix Corporation.) This controversy led us to investigate , as well, the effect of gender on the mentoring behavior of our study sample.

Specific Research Questions

Mentors were defined in this study as people who have had an especially positive influence on one's career. References to mentoring ascribe a wide variety of behaviors to people identified as mentors. A review of this literature yielded these twelve commonly mentioned contributions of mentors (Epstein, 1973; Kanter, 1977; Levinson, 1978; Roche, 1979; Kram, 1980; George and Kummerow, 1981; Moore and Salimbene, 1981; Phillips-Jones, 1982):

1. verbal encouragement,
2. guidance in a one-to-one relationship,
3. acclimation to the organization,
4. teaching the job itself,

5. sharing knowledge and experise related to the protege's career interests,
6. sponsoring by exposure to powerful decision-making and excitement,
7. critiquing the protege's work,
8. caring in an altruistic manner,
9. being perceived as a role model,
10. providing opportunities for protege visibility,
11. socializing after work hours, and
12. advising about career changes.

The first questions posed in this study were: 1a) Which of these behaviors do government agency supervisors report having received from their mentors? 1b) Which behaviors do they report providing to others?

A second issue is the relationships between the amount and kind of mentoring an individual received and the amount and kind of mentoring that an individual provides his/her proteges. Levinson (1980) reported that men who had not been mentored usually did not fill this role for others. Roche (1979) found that executives who had a mentor sponsored more proteges than those who had not. To learn how these findings apply in a government agency, we posed these research questions: 2a) What is the relationship between the amount of mentoring a supervisor received and that which he/she provides? 2b) What is the relationship between the kind of mentoring supervisors received and that which they provide?

The third issue is the effect of gender on mentoring behavior. As mentioned, this factor often was reported to affect the mentor-protege

relationship. The questions we investigated in the context of a government agency were: 3 a) Do men and women differ in the amount and/or kind of mentoring that they receive? 3 b) Do men and women differ in the amount and/or kind of mentoring that they provide? 3 c) Do women receive less (and/or different kinds of) mentoring from men than from women? 3 d) Do women provide more (and/or different kinds of) mentoring to women than to men?

The fourth issue was the motivations for or "levels" of mentoring. In her interviews of women in business, Phillips (1982) found a phenomenological difference between two types of mentors which she labelled primary mentors and secondary mentors. To their proteges, primary mentors appear to be going out of their way, taking risks, and making sacrifices to help them reach their life goals, i.e. they seem to act for altruistic reasons. Secondary mentors provide help, but their efforts are seen by proteges as more "business-like" with less emotional involvement. Moore and Salimbene (1981) reported a similar distinction and emphasized that secondary mentors did things that were beneficial primarily on the mentor's terms. Shapiro, Hazeltine and Rowe (1978) propose the term "partial role-models" for people who fit the category of secondary mentors due to their very limited accessibility to the protege. Our next research questions, therefore, were: To what extent do government agency supervisors report the reasons for mentoring commonly ascribed to primary and secondary men rs? Do men and women differ in the extent to which they report primary and secondary reasons for mentoring?

The fifth issue concerned the importance of mentoring in relation to other career advancement factors. Findings vary regarding the sig-

nificance of mentoring. For example, in a mentor/protege survey of 1250 top executives, Roche (1979) found that those who have had a mentor earn more money at a younger age, are better educated, are more likely to follow a career plan, and have higher job satisfaction. On the other hand, Anderson and Devanna (1981) using salary as their criterion, found virtually no difference between MBA graduates who had mentors and those who had not. To investigate this area we posed the questions: How do supervisors compare the importance of mentoring to other career advancement factors? Do men and women differ in the degree of importance they attribute to a mentor?

The last issue we considered was the mentor-protege age differential. Levinson (1977) found that mentors most often were roughly a half-generation, or eight to 15 years, older than their proteges. Among the 30 female managers and their male mentors surveyed by Fitt and Newton (1981), the age gap averaged 13 years. Variations from this pattern are likely to prevail, however, where people (Particularly women) re-enter the work force or change careers in mid-life. Bova and Phillips (1981) report that 36% of the mentor-protege pairs they studied began during the proteges' mid-life period. To assess this factor in our population we asked: What is the age differential between the mentor-protege pairs for (male and female) supervisors?

Methodology

Self-reports of supervisors in the Kansas Department of Human Resources provided the data used to answer the research questions. This relatively new department (established in 1976) employs 250 supervisors (who formerly had responsibility for thirteen human resource programs in

nine independent state agencies). It is organized into four Divisions: Employment, Workers Compensation, Labor-Management Relations and Employment Standards, and Staff Services.

From the total list of supervisors, a sample of 25 men and 25 women was drawn by using a table of random numbers. Because there were more male than female supervisors, the sampling continued until groups of equal size were selected. Ten alternates of each sex also were selected in this way. Of the initial groups, all the male supervisors and all but two of the female supervisors agreed to participate. Those two said that they were too busy, so they were replaced by two females from the alternates list. Later, the data from one male subject was found to be unusable. He, too, was replaced with a male from the alternates list.

The age range of the group is summarized in Table 1. The age categories coincide with life stages in adult development: leaving home (18-22), reaching out (23-28), transition (29-34), mid-life (35-44) settling down (45-54) , and late adulthood (55-64) (Gould, 1978). All supervisors were Caucasion, except for one Hispanic and two Black males.

(Insert Table 1 here)

At the time this study was conducted, the male supervisors had been employed by the government for a mean of 29 years, (many were veterans and several were retired military personnel), and the female supervisors for 12 years. The men had worked in the Human Resources Department for a mean of 12 years, the women for 11 years. The men supervise an ave-

erage of eight employees, the women six. On the forty-step government salary scale, the average male rating was 24.6; the average female rating was 21.7.

Since no instrument exists for gathering the data needed to answer the questions posed in this study, a Career Influencers Survey (CIS) was developed. (See Appendix). Information about the mentoring received and given by each supervisor was elicited using the CIS in a personal interview. The interviews were conducted by the first author; each lasted from 45 minutes to two hours.

The reliability of the CIS was assessed by administering it to ten supervisors in another state government agency. The CIS has four scales of 13 items each. Internal consistency of individuals' scores on each of the scales was measured using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (1970). The Alpha coefficient was .72427 for Scale A, .75607 for Scale B., .77432 for Scale C and .75381 for Scale D. In addition, item variances, inter-item covariances and inter-item correlations were computed. Corrected item totals, if each item was deleted also were calculated. None substantially changed the Alpha coefficients.

Face and construct valaidity of the CIS were determined by having several offficials in the state government agencies and a five-member panel of scholars at the University of Kansas who are familiar with career development and mentor theory literature, review the instrument. Each provided an oral and written critique, all of which resulted in minor changes being made to reduce ambiguity and bias in several items.

Results

Mentoring Behaviors. The 50 supervisors were asked on the first part of the CIS to complete a career time-line which, starting with their

first jobs, included all of the situations, positions, job changes, transfers and promotions, they had had to date. This exercise helped bring their entire work career to conscious awareness. Next, they listed all the persons (giving initials only) who had influenced their work life over the years. Third, they were asked to select the three people who most influenced their career. These three people were deemed their "mentors."

In the second part, the supervisors were asked to rate the frequency with which each mentor performed each of 13 mentoring behaviors. A five-point scale, ranging from "(1) rarely" to"(5) a great deal.... well beyond the call of duty...took special efforts to do so" was used. The supervisors later were asked to repeat the same process in regard to the people on whose careers they themselves had had the most influence. Table II provides the frequencies of their mentors' use of these behaviors, as well as the frequency with which the supervisors employed them with their own proteges. From this list we learn what mentoring behaviors are performed most frequently by mentors in a state government agency.

The second issue was the relationship between the amount and kind of mentoring the supervisors received and the amount and kind of mentoring they offered to their proteges. This data , too, can be found in Table II.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between the overall amount of mentoring received and given was .55 ($p < .01$) suggesting a moderately significant relationship. More specifically, there was a significant correlation ($p < .01$) between five kinds of mentoring behavior: offering friendship, open-door policy, inclusion in the "informal" network, and exposure to professional meetings and lightened your work load.

(Insert Table II here)

The third issue was the effect of sex role on mentoring behavior. Of the 150 mentors named by the supervisors, 111 (76%) were males and 39 (24%) were females. However, of the 150 proteges named by the supervisors 51 (34%) were males and 99 (66%) were females. Perhaps time has changed the gender make-up of this agency's supervisory population , or perhaps males are more likely to be in superordinate positions. and females in subordinate positions as Basil (1972) found in a study of government employees. We asked whether the men and women supervisors differed in the amount and kind of mentoring which they received and provided. Their responses are summarized in Table III. T-tests indicated that there was no significant difference between the amount or kind of mentoring males and females either gave or received. This finding suggests that men and women receive and provide similar amounts and kinds of mentoring behaviors.

(Insert Table III here)

We next asked about cross-gender mentoring. The 50 respondents were asked to name the sex of the three persons from whom they had received and to whom they had provided, mentoring. Males reported that 64 (85%) of their mentors were men and only 11 (15%) were women. Females reported that 47 (63%) of their mentors were men and 28 (37%) were women. The same contrast prevailed among the respondents' proteges. Men reported 41 (55%) male and 34 (45%) female proteges. Women reported 10 (13%) male

and 65 (87%) female proteges. These proportions indicate that although cross gender mentoring did occur, same sex mentoring is more common.

We also wanted to know whether women receive different amount or kinds of mentoring from men than they do from women as well as whether women give different amounts or kinds of mentoring to men than they do to other women. Sixty percent of the women supervisors studied had received cross gender mentoring. There was no significant difference between the amount of mentoring this group received from men and from women. Forty percent of the women supervisors provide cross-gender mentoring. Their mean mentoring score for men proteges was 43.7 and their mean mentoring score for women proteges was 89.6 , with a t value of -15.46. This difference is significant at the .01 level. In sum, women report providing other women significantly more mentoring than they do men.

When comparing the kinds of mentoring women reported receiving from males (N = 23) and females (N=17) moderately significant differences were found on only two of the 13 possible behaviors. These were "Helped you with career moves, clarified alternatives in your career path. ($p < .038$) and "Lightened your work load" ($p < .046$). Males were reported to perform both behaviors with greater frequency.

The kinds of mentoring the male and female supervisors report providing to their female proteges were compared. No significant differences were found, indicating that the kinds of mentoring behaviors used in cross-gender mentoring are similar to the kinds used in same-sex mentoring.

Primary and Secondary Mentoring. After reporting the kinds of mentoring they provided, the supervisors were asked to check the reasons

why they had acted as a mentor toward their proteges. The reasons are listed on Table IV, divided into primary and secondary categories, ordered by the frequency with which they were checked.

Reasons for mentoring divided between the primary and secondary categories, were compiled for each individual supervisor. Thirty-nine supervisors (15 males and 24 females) reported a predominance of primary reasons for mentoring and 11 supervisors (10 males and 1 female) reported a predominance of secondary reasons. When the reasons given by each supervisor are compared, primary reasons ($\overline{X}$ = 3.61, S.D. = 1.17) are reported significantly more frequently (t = 5.53, $p < .01$) than secondary reasons ($\overline{X}$ = 2.38, S.D. = 1.1). When this data is divided by gender, women report significantly more (t = 8.80, $p < .01$) primary reasons ($\overline{X}$ = 4.1, S.D. = .98) than secondary reasons ($\overline{X}$ = 2.03, S.D. 1.01). In sum, these supervisors (particularly female) perceive themselves to be operating as primary mentors.

(Insert Table IV here)

Importance of mentoring. The supervisors next were asked to select from a list of ten factors contributing to career development the five that were most important in their own careers. They ranked those five factors from one (most significant) to five (least significant). The factors are listed in the order of importance attributed to them by male and female supervisors in Table V. Two of the factors relate to mentoring: "Receiving guidance from a supervisor" and "Being sponsored/groomed by another person." The former was ranked third by men and fifth by women; the latter was ranked tenth by men and ninth by women.

(Insert Table V here)

Age and age spread of mentors and proteges. The final issue considered was the age and age spread between mentors and proteges. Respondents were asked to check the age range or "life stage" (Gould, 1978) When they encountered their mentors and proteges. These findiugs are summarized in Table VI. The modal age for receiving mentoring was 23-28 (which is consistent with what others have found in business settings). The data regarding their age for acting as mentors seems rather evenly distributed. Perhaps this is explained by responses indicating that the modal age at which they encountered their first protege was 23-28, their second 29-34, and their third 35-44. It seems that being a protege commonly is confined to a relatively short time-span early in one's career, and being a mentor can extend over several decades as one's career progresses.

(Insert Table VI here)

The mean age differential between the supervisors and their mentors was 19.1 for males and 19.8 for females. These amounts are above the 9-15 year span reported by Levinson (1976). The mean differential between the supervisors and their proteges was 6.8 for males and 1.9 for females. It appears that supervisors are mentoring proteges who are much closer in age to themselves than were their own mentors. However, the range of age differentials between supervisors and proteges spanned 92 years (from someone 42 years younger to someone 50 years older)! Consequently, it is difficult to make any generalizations about the age difference between mentors and proteges in this government agency.

We compared as well, the order in which a mentor was encountered and the degree of influence that person had. Table VII reports that data. Mentors tended to be ranked in the same order of importance as the order in which they were encountered.

(Insert Table VII here)

Discussion

The central purpose of this study was to contribute to the knowledge base about the mentor-protege relationship by obtaining perceptions of its dynamics from supervisors in a state government agency. We found first that all respondents (N = 50) had no trouble identifying three persons who had been "career influencers" for them, and three people who they themselves influenced, i.e. who had provided (to whom they provided) the 13 behaviors culled from the literature on mentoring indicating that the kinds of mentoring reported in studies of other kinds of organizations occur in a government agency, as well.

Incidentally, within this randomly selected group there were four mentor-protege pairs. None were aware that the other was in the sample or that he/she had been identified. The flavor of mentor-protege interaction is illustrated in the following set of comments by one of these pairs:

THE MENTOR:

> I looked out over the sea of desks and thought, 'How am I going to handle this extra assignment?' As I stood there musing, (Name)_____ looked up at me from her desk across the room. . . and smiled. I suddenly realized that here was my answer. (Name)_____ had worked as a 'temporary' for the last few months. She had previously worked in the department, but had been at home raising her small children for

several years. She was bright, she was friendly and even when she did not know the mechanics of the job she was always eager and willing to learn. Whenever I asked her for help, she did the work quickly and enthusiastically. This girl has capabilities that even she doesn't know. I am going to help her go just as far as I can.

THE PROTEGE:

I love my work, and the real chances I have here. (Name) has been a big help to me in encouraging me. In the last year, I have had several assignments and am learning a lot. Each gets more complicated. The latest is a new training idea that I'm really excited about. I know it is going to work. It's for hard-core unemployed fellahs. If we can just get them to come! Whenever I have an idea that I'm pretty sure will work I talk to (Name) and she really encourages me to try it. (Name) would have to be my most influential mentor. I respect her and I like to work for her. I never thought of her as a mentor but I guess she would have to be. . .Yes, she is my mentor.

The most commonly reported mentoring behaviors received were: 1) Maintained an open door policy spent time with you and was available to you2) Verbally gave support and encouragement, and 3) Spent time in one-to-one counseling and discussion. Those mentioned least often were: 1) Took you to professional/management meetings, exposed you to powerful decision-making and 2) lightened your work load. The last two particularly suggest how mentoring in a government agency differs from what occurs in other settings. Attendance at professional and decision-making meetings seems less important to career progress and most respondents indicated that their mentors increased their work load (thereby preparing them for upward mobility) rather than lightening it. Since these behaviors were attributed to the three people in each respondent's life who were most influential in their career success, they provide guidelines for what people in government agencies can do to help other's

career development.

From our comparison between the amount and kind of mentoring people receive and what they provide to others (r =.55, p .01), it seems that supervisors' own mentors influenced their subsequent mentoring behaviors, specifically in regard to offering friendship, maintaining an open-door policy, inclusion in the informal network, exposure to professional meetings and lightening their work load. Perhaps mentoring is guided more by such personal history rather than by conscious planning. If so, should government supervisors wish to nurture career progress among their employees , they might do well to deliberately employ the mentoring behaviors reported most often by these supervisors rather than limiting themselves to what they recall their mentors doing.

We found, too, that most often men were mentors and proteges were women (due perhaps to males generally higher status in the agency). However, no significant differences were found between males and females regarding the amount or kind of mentoring behavior either received or provided. Gender became more significant as a variable in instances of cross-gender mentoring. First, we found that same sex mentoring (198 cases , 66%) to be more common than cross-sex mentoring (102 cases, 32%) due perhaps to a reluctance on the part of men to receive mentoring from women or to women's lack of organizational status or to women's choice of female proteges.

Second, we found no significant difference between the amount of mentoring the women supervisors had received from their male or female mentors. However, the women supervisors did report providing their own female proteges more than twice as much mentoring (p = .01) as their male proteges. Third, the women supervisors reported receiving signifi-

cantly more help with two kinds of mentoring behaviors from their male mentors: Help with career moves and lightening of their work load (the latter being a dubious value). There were no significant differences, on the other hand, between the kinds of mentoring behaviors the male and female supervisors reported providing to their female proteges.

These findings include some interesting contrasts. First, the women supervisors received a similar amount of mentoring from their individual male and female mentors, but provide more mentoring to each of their female proteges. Perhaps this finding is related to the facts that 1) same-sex mentoring predominates and 2) women are concerned at the perceived shortage of mentoring available to other women.

Second, although female supervisors provide more mentoring to female proteges, there is no difference between the kinds of mentoring that men and women mentors provide. This suggests that some equity does prevail for male and female supervisors since the kinds of behaviors employed are not significantly different.

Finally, althought the finding that the women supervisors received more help from their male than from their female mentors in two mentoring areas may seem to contradict cross-gender research reported elsewhere, it should be noted that the usual trouble spots --socializing and inclusion in informal and professional networks -- were not different. Nevertheless, the fact that these kinds of help were not offered significantly less often indicates somewhat more cross-gender equity in this government agency than in some organizations. The fact that male mentors lightened female proteges work load more than their women mentors did may indicate

that women tend to expect more from other women than men do.

The influence of gender carried over into the findings regarding primary and secondary reasons for mentoring. Women reported significantly more primary than secondary reasons, corroborating their "beyond the call of duty" altruistic motives for providing mentoring for their proteges--who predominantly are other women. (While men did, too, the difference was not significant).

The findings regarding the perceived importance of mentoring relative to eight other factors in career development tend to reflect the same ambiguity found in other mentoring literature. In this government agency, mentoring seems neither pre-eminent nor immaterial. Career development seems to be affected by a host of factors, of which mentoring is only one.

The age at which mentoring is received seems concentrated between 23 and 28, but these supervisors generally began providing mentoring during that same period and continued with subsequent proteges through the next two age periods (29-34 and 35-44). These findings are quite consistent with other research on mentoring. The age differential between these supervisors and their mentors was a bit larger, but also comparable to most mentoring reports. However, the age differential between them and their proteges is less and much wider in range than has been reported elsewhere. Perhaps this is due to 1) the varied ages at which state government employees begin working or 2) the skewing of mentor-protege age levels due to the increased technical experise needed to handle computerization of this agency's personnel records. Finally, the fact that the supervisors ascribed greatest importance to their first mentors suggests that particular attention be given to mentor-protege relationships at the

very earliest points in person's work life.

In sum, we discovered that the mentoring behaviors reported in other organizational contexts occur in a government agency as well. No other study ranked the frequency with which these behaviors are employed in private or public sector organizations, so no such comparison can be made. Further research might investigate whether the same relative incidence of these behaviors prevails elsewhere, particularly the rarity of exposure to decision-making and lightening the work load that we found. These two may be myths of mentoring and not realities.

The similarity between the amount and kind of mentoring received and provided also is noteworthy. This finding may have been affected by the fact that these supervisors were describing virtually the totality of their career experiences as proteges (Most were beyond the age and status for being in this role), but several had many years of potential mentoring yet to give. Had we asked people closer to retirement about their overall protege and mentor experiences, our findings might have been somewhat different.

The major effect of gender seemed to be the greater amount of mentoring women offered to women over men. They appear to be filling a gap in what men provide as reported by women in other organizational contexts as well. The preponderance of primary (or altruistic) mentoring reasons, especially by women, suggests that people in government are contributing to subordinates' careers for other than selfish reasons. However, mentoring is not sufficient to override the other factors in career progress (i.e. it's what you know as well as who you know that counts). The age of mentor and protege and the spread between them matters little for a

mentor-protege relationship to occur. However, the first mentor a person encounters is reported to be the most influential.

A few comments by respondents in this project suggest still more directions for further study. During the interviews, one supervisor asked, "Do you want someone who was a good career influencer or someone who drove me in the other direction?" Another said, "I started out with this person and we had a good relationship, but it eventually turned sour and we ended on a very bad note!" The effects of negative mentoring could be explored.

Finally, one person selected for the sample was unable to respond due to a perceived polarity between his Native American values and career mentoring concepts. He was not included in this study for fear that invalid data would be collected by an instrument not intrinsic to the language and schema of his culture. Hence, cross-cultural studies of mentoring also seem to be in order.

REFERENCES

Anderson, C. and Devanna, M. A. Mentors: can they help women get ahead? Career Development Bulletin, 2 (2), 1981, 5-8.

Basil, Douglas C. Women in Management. New York: Dunellon University Press of Cambridge, Mass., 1972.

Bass, B.M. Life goals and career success of European and American managers. Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commercilik, 23, (2), 1976, 154-171.

Bova, B. and Phillips, R. The mentor relationship: a study of mentors and proteges in business and academia. Unpublished Paper, University of New Mexico, 1981.

Bray, D.W.; Campbell, R.J. and Grant, D.L. Formative Years in Business: A Long-term A.T. & T. Study of Managerial Lives. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1974.

Cameron, Susan W. and Blackburn, R.T. Sponsorship and academic career success. Journal of Higher Education 1981, 53, (4) 369-77.

Collin, Audrey. Notes on some typologies of managerial development and the role of mentor in the process of adaptation of the individual to the organization. Personnel Review, 1979, 8 (4), 10-14.

Epstein, D.F. Woman's place: options and limits in professional careers. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1973.

Fitt, L.W. & Newton, D.A. When the mentor is a man and the protege a woman. Harvard Business Review, 58, March-April, 1981, 59-60.

George, P & Kummerow, J. Mentoring for career women. Training HRD, February, 1981, 44-49.

Gould, Roger. Transformations. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978.

Hennig, Margaret & Jardim, Anne. The Managerial Woman. New York: Anchor Press, Doubleday, 1977.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Books, Inc., 1977.

Kram, Kathy. Understanding Sponsor and Other Developmental Mentor Relationships. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1978.

Laws, J. J. The Psychology of tokenism: an analysis. Sex Roles 1975, (1), 51-67.

Levinson, D.J. The mentor relationship. In M. Morgan (Ed.) Managing Career Development. New York: K. Van Nostrand, 1980.

Lynch, Joan P. Maturing into Adulthood: The Lives of Working-Class Women. Unpublished undergraduate Honors Thesis, Smith College, February, 1978.

Moore, K.M. & Salimbene, Ann M. The dynamics of the mentor-protege relationship in developing women as academic leaders. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 1981, (2) 1, 51-64.

Phillips-Jones, L.L. Mentors and Proteges. New York: Arbor House 1982.

Rawles, B.A. The Influence of a Mentor on the Level of Self-Actualization of American Scientists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the Ohio State University, 1980.

Roche, G.R. Much ado about mentors. Harvard Business Review. January-February, 1979, 14-20.

Shapiro, E.C., Haseltine, F., and Rose, M. P. Moving up: role models, mentors, and the patron system. Sloan Management Review, Spring, 1978, 51-58.

TABLE 1

SEX AND AGE OF SUPERVISORS

AGE RANGE (YEARS)

Sex	Years					
	18-22	23-28	29-34	35-44	45-54	55-64
Male	--	--	5 (10%)	7 (14%)	9 (18%)	4 (8%)
Female	--	2 (4%)	9 (18%)	8 (16%)	2 (4%)	4 (8%)

TABLE II

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE KIND AND AMOUNT
OF MENTORING RECEIVED AND PROVIDED

Overall Rank	Behavior	Overall $\bar{X}$	Received R	Received $\bar{X}$	Received SD	Provided R	Provided $\bar{X}$	Provided SD	r	(i) t
					N=50			N=50		
1.	Maintained an open door policy, spent time with & was available to you	12.5	1	12.6	2.11	1	12.4	2.31	.47**	1.52
2.	Verbally gave support & encouragement	11.98	2	12.5	1.5	4	11.96	1.95	.12	.30
3.	Spent time in one-to-one counseling and discussion	11.81	4	11.34	2.	2	12.28	2.04	.15	- .9
4.	When opportunities arose, made an effort to give you the inside track	11.63	5	11.22	1.9	3	12.04	2.34	.30*	-6.18**
5.	Saw you were recognized for accomplishments	11.54	3	11.5	1.91	6	11.58	2.5	.19	- .49
6.	Included you in the "informal" network	11.18	10	10.54	2.95	5	11.82	2.59	.44**	-7.95**
7.	Actively taught, planned with shown what was important	11.12	6	11.02	1.82	8	11.22	2.76	.23	-1.18
8.	Helped you with career moves, clarified alternatives in your career path	11.01	9	10.7	2.12	7	11.32	2.39	.07	-3.48**
9.	Was consciously aware of his/her importance as a role model	10.69	8	10.82	2.70	10	10.48	2.58	.06	1.53
10.	Provided you with special expertise	10.36	7	10.86	2.23	11	9.86	2.98	.29*	5.48**
11.	Offered friendship, included you in social & family life	10.12	11	10.	3.2	9	10.64	2.45	.49**	-3.79**
12.	Took you to professional meetings, exposed you to powerful decision-making	7.73	12	8.04	3.37	13	7.42	3.3	.37**	2.87*
13.	Lightened your work load	7.69	13	6.94	3.15	12	8.44	3.2	.39**	-7.41**
	Combined Total Amount								.5488**	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF AMOUNT AND KINDS OF

MENTORING BEHAVIOR USING t TESTS

Mentoring	AMOUNT							KINDS						
	MALE			FEMALE			(i)	MALE			FEMALE			(i)
	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
Received	25	137.68	17.17	25	137.48	19.36	.04	25	10.67	1.38	25	10.56	1.78	.24
Provided	25	141.08	20.28	25	141.84	18.08	.14	25	10.85	1.24	25	10.91	1.82	-.14
(Dep) t		.94			1.22				.72			1.02		

TABLE IV

REASONS FOR MENTORING

A. Primary Motivations

REASONS	Male N=25		Female N=25	
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$
Feel good to see the way an employee gets ahead.	1	7.72	1	8.64
Gain satisfaction from showing him/her the ropes.	2	7.12	2	8.00
Be a friend.	3	6.36	4	7.40
Experience pleasant feelings.	4	6.28	3	7.88
Support/endorse affirmative action.	5	4.72	5	5.6
Do something for future generations.	6	3.88	6	5.32

B. Secondary Motivations

Benefit from work an employee does well.	1	7.08	2	6.96
Get your own work done.	2.5	6.4	5	5.12
Develop important subordinates.	2.5	6.4	4	6.12
Serve as "gatekeeper" for the organization.	4	6.28	1	7.88
Perform official duties.	5	5.72	3	6.36
Enhance your career.	6	4.32	6	3.72
Repay past favors.	7	3.56	7	3.36

TABLE V

TEN CAREER PROGRESS FACTORS

RANKED BY GENDER

Females N = 25			Males N = 25		
Rank	Factor	$\%/\bar{X}$	Rank	Factor	$\%/\bar{X}$
1.	Having strong desire, drive and determination.	40.37	1.	Being competent.	31.37
2.	Being competent.	37.86	2.	Knowledge gained in training or school.	26.96
3.	Receiving guidance from a supervisor.	20.48	3.	Having strong desire, drive and determination.	26.89
4.	Having a good personality, getting along with others.	17.98	4.	Having a good personality, getting along with others.	20.07
5.	Being aggressive about recognition of talents.	17.33	5.	Receiving guidance from a supervisor.	17.02
6.	Knowledge gained in training or school.	12.50	6.	Being aggressive about recognition of talents.	12.00
7.	Spouse support.	11.80	7.	Luck or fate.	10.76
8.	Luck or fate.	10.00	8.	Spouse support.	10.47
9.	Changing geographical location.	3.60	9.	Being sponsored or groomed by another person.	9.00
10.	Being sponsored/groomed by another person	2.00	10.	Changing geographical location.	7.14

TABLE VI

AGE RANGE WHEN ENCOUNTERING MENTORS AND PROTEGES

	AGE RANGE					
	18-22	23-28	29-34	35-44	45-54	55-64
Mentors	37(25%)	60(40%)	34(23%)	15(10%)	4 (2%)	--
Proteges	6 (4%)	37(25%)	39(26%)	32(21%)	24(16%)	12 (8%)

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF ORDER THAT MENTOR WAS ENCOUNTERED TO INFLUENCE OF THE MENTOR

	Greatest Influence		Second Most Influential		Third Most Influential	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
First Mentor	25	50	12	24	13	26
Second Mentor	14	28	27	54	9	18
Third Mentor	11	22	11	22	28	56
Total	50	100	50	100	50	100